

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite. The claims have been amended to more clearly point out the invention as suggested by examiner.

Examiner rejected claims 5 and 7-9 under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by US patent 5,433,565 to Chan. Chan teaches a winch bar not a speed handle. The claims have been amended to more clearly point out the invention. Claims 5 and 8 call for a rotation of the handle about the crank axis portion. In Chan the winch bar never makes a full rotation and to the extent that it partially rotates, only rotates about the winch axis and does not have its own axis of rotation as disclosed and claimed. Winch bars like that proposed by Chan are common in the industry and are designed to place a high torque on a strap winch when tightening a strap to secure a load. Winch bars are never used to wind excess strap back on the winch as the process would be too slow. Claim 7 further clarifies that there is a 180 degree bend in the crank. Claim 8 now calls for a 'speed handle'. These differences are important because they allow the device as disclosed and claimed to function as a speed handle to rapidly wind up strap. The winch bar shown by Chan will wind strap but only at a rate of a quarter turn per motion with each motion being interrupted by removing the bar from one hole 25 and placing the bar in the next hole 25. This leads to a very slow strap take up process which the current invention seeks to improve.

Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5 and 7 under 35 USC 102 b as anticipated by Salemno et al. Salemno et al discloses a winding crank device assembly.

The crank of Salemno et al is a multi-piece design. The claims have been amended to clarify that the crank in the present invention is one piece, though the entire handle includes the rotating roller and end piece that retains the crank in the lug in use. Salemno et al discloses a multi-piece crank that will be more difficult to manufacture. Claims 4 and 5 contain the limitation that the one piece crank is one piece of bar stock. This is not shown in Salemno and is important because bar stock provides a cheap and efficient way to form the one piece crank. Applicant's one piece crank could function as a complete strap winding speed handle which is not shown in any of the prior art, but applicant adds the rotating roller and end piece to improve performance as disclosed. Claim 7 contains the limitation of the bend being 180 degrees which allows the one piece of bar stock to form a device useful as a speed handle with the extension portion approximately perpendicular to the axis portion.

Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 USC 103 in view of Chan. Claim 6 and the rest of the claims have been amended to more clearly disclose the cap portion which retains the extension arm portion in the lug during cranking.

Examiner indicated that claims 2 and 10 would be allowable if amended to contain the intervening limitations. Claim 2 has been re-presented but claim 1, from which 2 depends, has been amended to contain the limitations of original claim 10. Claim 10 has been re-presented but claim 8 from which it depends now contains the cap limitation from original claim 2.

For the reasons listed above, it is felt that all the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

It is believed that the above amendments of the claims clarifies the scope of the claims, and at the same time indicates the novelty and inventive step of the claims as amended.

In the event that you wish to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the agent at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,


Mark Manley

Agent of record

I certify that this correspondence will be deposited with the United States Postal Service as express mail having label # ER 606899835 US .